

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

POST-CONTINUED APPOINTMENT REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Revised by the Continued Appointment
Track Faculty Affairs Committee and
approved by the Library Faculty Association
May 2017

Previously revised by the Faculty Affairs Committee
and approved by the Library Faculty Association
April 2012

Continued Appointment Track Faculty Affairs Committee
Kira Dietz
Tracy Gilmore
Edward Lener
Andi Ogier
Sam Winn

1. Introduction

1.1. This document describes the post-continued appointment review process for University Libraries faculty. It supplements and clarifies information in the *Faculty Handbook*; it does not supersede the official university policies and procedures. “Post-continued appointment review” as used in this and in university documents applies to library faculty with continued appointment as well as those awarded tenure before the continued-appointment system was instituted.

1.2. “A post-continued appointment review is mandatory whenever a faculty member with continued appointment receives two consecutive annual evaluations of unsatisfactory performance...The purpose of a post-continued appointment review is to focus the perspective of faculty peers on the full scope of a faculty member’s professional competence, performance, and contributions to the division, and university mission and priorities.” (Virginia Tech *Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.6.4)

1.3. Post-continued appointment review procedures do not abridge the university’s right to proceed directly to dismissal for cause as defined in *Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.7.3, nor the right of faculty members to pursue existing mechanisms of reconciliation and redress.

2. How post-continued appointment review is initiated

2.1. Expectations and standards for library faculty performance are described in the University Libraries' *Faculty Evaluation Procedures* and the *Procedures on Promotion and Continued Appointment: University Libraries (PP&CA)*. Failure to meet minimal standards results in an "unsatisfactory" rating. Post-continued appointment review is triggered when a faculty member receives two successive ratings of unsatisfactory. Annual reviews for years spent on leave without pay shall be disregarded.

2.2. The supervisor shall provide written notification of an unsatisfactory rating and the considerations upon which they are based to the faculty member, with copies to the dean of University Libraries and the university provost.

2.3. The supervisor may recommend, and the dean of the University Libraries may approve, that a post-continued appointment review be waived or postponed if there are extenuating circumstances, such as health problems.

2.4. The dean of University Libraries shall inform the faculty member and Post-Continued Appointment Review Committee that a review has commenced. All deadlines and other timetables in this document shall be measured from the date the faculty member is notified.

3. The Post-Continued Appointment Review Committee

3.1. The Post-Continued Appointment Review Committee consists of the five elected members of the University Libraries' Promotion and Continued Appointment Committee (L-P&CA), with the following exceptions:

3.1.1. The individual who assigned the unsatisfactory rating may not serve on the committee.

3.1.2. The faculty member who is undergoing post-continued appointment review may not serve on the committee.

3.2. The Library Faculty Association Executive Board will hold an election to fill any additional vacancies, to ensure that the committee has a full complement of five voting members.

3.3. Elections to fill vacancies on the committee shall follow the procedures set forth for the L-P&CA Committee in the University Libraries' *Procedures for Promotion and Continued Appointment*.

3.4. The committee shall elect its own chair and recorder.

3.5. Once a committee has begun deliberations on a case the same members will follow the case to its conclusion.

4. Conducting the post-continued appointment review

4.1. The burden of proving unsatisfactory performance is on the university.

4.2. Post-continued appointment reviews and remediation, sanctions, or dismissal, if any, shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures specified in *Faculty Handbook*, secs. 4.6.4 and 4.7.

4.3. The faculty member under review shall provide the committee with a dossier including all documents, materials, and statements he or she believes to be relevant and necessary for the review.

4.3.1. The dossier should include at least the following: a letter of introduction, an up-to-date curriculum vitae, current position description, the past two or more Faculty Activity Reports (FARs), and a description of activities and accomplishments since the last FAR. Letters of reference may be included.

4.3.2. The faculty member shall be given a period of no less than four weeks to assemble the dossier for the committee.

4.4. The faculty member's supervisor shall supply the committee with the last two annual evaluations, all materials that were considered in those evaluations, other materials he or she deems relevant, and any materials requested by the committee.

4.5. The committee shall provide the faculty member with copies of all materials. The faculty member has the right to provide a written rebuttal of evidence provided.

4.6. The committee shall weigh the faculty member's contributions to the University Libraries, the university, and the profession through his/her fulfillment of professional responsibilities, service and professional activities, and research, creative, and scholarly achievements.

4.7. All recommendations of the committee shall be determined by a majority vote of the entire committee. Abstentions are not permitted.

4.8. The committee shall find and certify in its report that the faculty member's performance and/or professional contributions either:

4.8.1. Minimally meet or exceed the Libraries' expectations and standards, "Certification of satisfactory performance" (*Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.6.4), thus completing the review, or

4.8.2. Do not meet the Libraries' expectations and standards.

4.9. If the committee finds that the faculty member has not met the Libraries' expectations and standards, it shall recommend "Certification of deficiencies" (*Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.6.4):

4.9.1. A single period of remediation not to exceed two years, or

4.9.2. Imposition of severe sanction as detailed in *Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.7.2, or

4.9.3. Dismissal for cause as detailed in *Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.7.3.

4.10. The committee shall prepare a summary of its findings and recommendation and submit these to the supervisor and the dean of University Libraries, with a copy to the provost.

4.11. The dean shall notify the faculty member of the committee recommendations and shall, with the concurrence of the provost, oversee their implementation. While the dean retains final responsibility, he/she may delegate notification and day-to-day oversight to the faculty member's supervisor.

4.12. The committee secretary shall assure that all records pertaining to committee deliberations are handled in accordance with university records-retention policies.

5. Implementing Post-Continued Appointment Review Committee recommendations

5.1. If the committee recommends remediation, its recommendation shall specify, in detail, the deficiencies it has noted, define specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve, and establish a timeline for meeting those goals.

5.2. The supervisor shall meet with the faculty member at least twice annually to review the faculty member's progress.

5.3. The supervisor shall prepare a summary report for the committee following each meeting and at the end of the specified remediation period. The faculty member may provide his/her own reports as well.

5.4. At the conclusion of the remediation period, the committee shall review the reports and:

5.4.1. Certify satisfactory performance, or

5.4.2. Recommend that a severe sanction be imposed, or

5.4.3. Recommend dismissal for cause.

5.5. A further period of remediation is not an option.

5.6. A faculty member under review or in a period of remediation specified by the committee remains subject to the annual evaluation policy. However, further ratings of "Unsatisfactory" shall not be assigned him/her until the committee has submitted its final certification or recommendation.

5.7. If the committee recommends a severe sanction or dismissal for cause it shall refer the case, including the full record, to the University Promotion and Continued Appointment Committee for Extra-collegiate Faculty for resolution under *Faculty Handbook*, sec. 4.7.